



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,703	12/27/2001	Aviad Hellman	200/02444	1067
44909	7590	09/26/2005	EXAMINER	
WOLF, BLOCK, SCHORR & SOLIS-COHEN LLP			JONES, HEATHER R	
250 PARK AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10177			2615	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/019,703

Applicant(s)

HELLMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Heather R. Jones

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/27/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Courtney (EP 0 967 584 A2).

Regarding claim 1, Courtney discloses in Fig. 1 a surveillance unit, comprising: a video camera (23) which provides images in the form of electrical signals (col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 9); a control circuitry (27) which determines when to store the images captured by the camera (col. 3, lines 23-28 and 38-44; col. 11, lines 28-34); and a slot for operationally receiving a memory card on which the images are stored as determined by the control circuitry (col. 7, lines 18-20 – it is inherent that the hard disk drive would have a slot for a memory card to be inserted into it).

Regarding claim 2, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the surveillance unit further comprises at least one detector (24) which provides signals to the control circuitry (col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 9).

Regarding claim **3**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 2 including that the at least one detector comprises an infrared detector (col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 9).

Regarding claim **4**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the control circuitry determines when the digital camera should capture images (col. 13, lines 39-51 – the control circuitry (27) determines when to capture a new reference image therefore it determines when the digital camera should capture images).

Regarding claim **5**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the control circuitry performs the determination responsive to video motion detection (VMD) performed on images captured by the camera (col. 9, lines 6-12).

Regarding claim **6**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing that the control circuitry comprises a processor (33) which receives signals from the at least one detector and determines whether to store the captured images (col. 7, lines 10-15; col. 11, lines 28-34).

Regarding claim **13**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing that the surveillance unit further comprises a communication link (14 or 349) for transmitting at least some of the images captured by the camera (col. 6, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim **14**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 13 including that the communication link comprises a wireless link (col. 4, lines 15-21).

Regarding claim **15**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 13 including that the communication link comprises a wire link (col. 6, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim **16**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing that the control circuitry stores a log of events on the memory card (col. 13, lines 11-22).

Regarding claims **17** and **18**, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing that the surveillance unit further comprises an internal image memory for storing images captured by the camera and that at least some of the captured images are stored on the internal image memory and are automatically downloaded to the memory card responsive to insertion of the memory card into the slot (col. 11, lines 28-34 – only important information is saved on the memory card, so it is inherent that there is an internal memory that stores the other images until it is determined that the image is not needed and that once the memory card is inserted then all further important images will be saved on it).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-12 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Steinberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,006,039).

Regarding claim 7, Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1, but fails to disclose that the memory card comprises a storage area for operational data of the surveillance unit.

Referring to the Steinberg et al. reference, Steinberg et al. discloses a digital camera wherein the camera has the capability of being programmed by an external device through the serial port or PCMCIA card (col. 2, lines 17-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the teaching of programming the camera through the use of a memory card as disclosed by Steinberg et al. with the surveillance unit disclosed by Courtney in order to allow the surveillance unit the ability to adjust image acquisition parameters through an external device or the capability of changing the camera operating system and downloading an

executable code to conform to a particular available PC operating system through an external device.

Regarding claim **8**, Courtney in view of Steinberg et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the operational data is downloaded from the removable memory card to an internal memory of the surveillance memory of the surveillance unit when the memory card is inserted into the surveillance unit (Steinberg et al.: Fig. 2; col. 5, lines 24-30).

Regarding claim **9**, Courtney in view of Steinberg et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the operational data comprises a software routine run by the processor (Steinberg et al.: col. 2, lines 48-51).

Regarding claim **10**, Courtney in view of Steinberg et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 including that the operational data comprises one or more operation parameters of the surveillance unit (Steinberg et al.: Fig. 3; col. 6, lines 6-13).

Regarding claim **11**, Courtney in view of Steinberg et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1, 7, and 10 including that the operational data comprise at least one operation parameter of the camera (Steinberg et al.: Fig. 3; col. 6, lines 6-13).

Regarding claim **12**, Courtney in view of Steinberg et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1, 7, and 10 including

that the one or more operation parameters comprise at least one parameter which governs the level of indications required from the at least one detector to define an alarm state in which images from the camera are permanently stored (Steinberg et al.: col. 6, lines 6-13 – discloses that other parameters are also included other than just the ones shown in Fig.3; Courtney: col. 4, lines 34-45).

Regarding claim **19**, Steinberg et al. discloses a method of controlling the operation of a camera unit, comprising: storing operational data of the camera unit on a removable memory card; and inserting the memory card into a predefined slot of the camera unit (col. 2, lines 48-51; col. 6, lines 6-13). However, Steinberg et al. fails to disclose of controlling the operation of a surveillance unit.

Referring to the Courtney reference, Courtney discloses a surveillance unit that can be controlled by an external device (col. 4, lines 34-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to used the teaching of remotely controlling a surveillance unit with the teaching of controlling the operation of a camera unit from a external device as disclosed by Steinberg et al. in order to be able to control a surveillance unit from an external device by storing all the operational parameters on a removable memory card. By placing all the parameters on a removable memory card the external device would have not have to be connected to the surveillance unit through a wire or wireless connection. Therefore, the surveillance unit could be controlled easily from the external

device without caring how far away the external device is from the surveillance unit.

Regarding claim **20**, Steinberg et al. in view of Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 19 as well as disclosing that storing the operational data comprises inserting the removable memory card into a reader coupled to a computer and writing the operational data on the memory card by the computer (Steinberg et al: Fig. 2; col. 5, lines 16-30).

Regarding claim **21**, Steinberg et al. in view of Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 19 and 20 including that the surveillance unit further comprises receiving operational data by the computer over a communication link (Steinberg et al.: Figs. 1 and 2; col. 5, lines 16-59).

Regarding claim **22**, Steinberg et al. in view of Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 19 and 20 including that storing the operational data comprises using a graphical software running on the computer to adjust the operational data (Steinberg et al.: col. 1, lines 9-15, 34-37, and 52-56).

Regarding claim **23**, Steinberg et al. in view of Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 19 including that the operational data comprises a software which runs on a processor of the - surveillance unit (Steinberg et al.: col. 2, lines 47-51).

Regarding claim **24**, Steinberg et al. in view of Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 19 including that the operational data comprises one or more parameters of the surveillance unit (Steinberg et al.: Fig. 3; col. 6, lines 6-13).

Regarding claim **25**, Steinberg et al. in view of Courtney discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 19 as well as disclosing that the surveillance camera further comprises storing images captured by a camera of the surveillance unit on the memory card inserted into the surveillance unit (Courtney: col. 7, lines 18-20; Steinberg et al.: col. 2, lines 20-22).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather R. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on 571-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2615

HRJ
September 19, 2005


DAVID L. OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT
EXAMINER